

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 98, 100-102, 106, 107, 112-124, and 126-130 are currently pending. Claims 1-97, 99, 103-105, 108-111, and 125 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter claimed therein.

Claim 125-130 have been objected to for depending upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The features of canceled claims 99 and 125 have been incorporated into claim 98. Accordingly, claims 98, 100-102, 106, 107, 112-124, and 126-130, as they stand, should be allowable.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 98 has been amended to include the features of claims 99 and 125. Claims 126-130 have been amended to correct their dependencies. The amendments to these claims do not introduce prohibited new matter.

Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 98-102, 106, 107, 112, 113, 118-121, and 124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,856,219 (Stayton) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,755,365 (Meredith).

Claim 98 has been amended to include the features of claim 125, which was indicated in the Office Action, dated July 22, 2010, as being allowable if it were rewritten as an independent claim to include the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 98, which includes the features of claim 125 and intervening claim 99, and claims that depend from claim 98, all should be allowable .

B. Claims 114, 116, 117, 122, and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayton in view of Meredith and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0024656 (Morris).

Claims 114, 116, 117, 122, and 123 are indirectly dependent upon claim 98, which as discussed immediately above has been amended to include the features of claim 125 and

intervening claim 99. Accordingly, claims 114, 116, 117, 122, and 123 also include the features of claim 125 and claim 99. These claims, as they stand, should be allowable.

C. Claim 115 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stayton in view of Meredith and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,637,931 (Schmitz).

Claim 115 is indirectly dependent upon claim 98, which as discussed immediately above has been amended to include the features of claim 125 and intervening claim 99. Accordingly, claim 115 also includes the features of claim 125 and intervening claim 99. Claim 125, as it stands, should be allowable.

Conclusion

The foregoing amendments and remarks are being made to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. A favorable action is awaited. Should an interview be helpful to further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

/Sally Teng/

Date: January 22, 2010
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Customer No. **09629**
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000

Sally P. Teng
Registration No. 45,397